

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/534,550 | 05/09/2005 | Lee Simon | SIM-I | 7162 | |
| | 7590 07/11/2007 Γ LAW FIRM, P.C. | EXAMINER | | | |
| 9 MIRAMAR LANE | | | TRAN, HANH VAN | | |
| STAMFORD, CT 06902 | | | ART UNIT | ,PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3637 | | |
| • | | | | , | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 07/11/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/534,550 | SIMON, LEE | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Hanh V. Tran | 3637 | |

| | | naill v. Itali | 3037 | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE | REPLY FILED <u>29 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. 🖾 | The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in | Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) | | | | |
| b) | no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH | ng date of the final reject | ion. |
| - | TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 sions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date | | 136(a) and the engrapsis | to ovtonsion foo |
| have I under set foi may re | peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sthin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office latereduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Off | iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as |
| | The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | o avoid dismissal of th | |
| | NDMENTS | | | |
| 3. 🖂 | The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | | | ecause |
| | (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | | TE below); | |
| | (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | | . d alman an aimmalife in a | the incurs for |
| | (c) They are not deemed to place the application in betappeal; and/or | | | the issues for |
| | (d) \square They present additional claims without canceling a | | jected claims. | |
| | NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | |
| 4. 🔲 | The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. 🔲 | | | | |
| 6. 🔲 | Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | llowable if submitted in a separate | , timely filed amendme | ent canceling the |
| 7. 🔀 | For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | ill be entered and an | explanation of |
| | Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| | Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5, 12, 21, 24-33</u> . | | | |
| A | Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| | DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | ut before or on the date of filing a N Id sufficient reasons why the affida | lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i | ot be entered is necessary and |
| 9. 🔲 | The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | eal and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |
| | The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | on of the status of the claims after e | entry is below or attac | hed. |
| | UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| 11. [| The request for reconsideration has been considered by | ut does NOT place the application | in condition for allowa | ince because: |
| 12. [| Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| 13. 🏻 | Other: See Continuation Sheet. | · | . <i>D</i> . | |
| | | | Em. Cles | |
| | | JAN | ET M. WILKENS | |
| | | PRIN | MARY EXAMINEP | |
| 1 | 1./- | 1/1 | 1,13(3) | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: rejections still applicable; regading claim 24, line 2, numeral 28 should not be underlined; claim 26, line 2, "from a group" should be "from the group", line 3, "0" should be "to".

Continuation of 13. Other: In response to applicant's argument on page 6 regarding the 112(2) rejection of claim 4, the examiner takes the position that the claim is indefinite for failing to clearly define the metes and bounds of the claim invention; it appears to be redundant. Should applicant elect to amend the claim to overcome this rejection, "and/or" should be "or".